REMARKS

In the Office Action dated August 15, 2007, claims 1 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohn et al. in view of Everett et al. Claims 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohn et al., in view of Everett et al., further in view of Roesner. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohn et al. in view of Everett et al. and Roesner, further in view of Sheffet. Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohn et al. in view of Everett et al., further in view of Sheffet.

Applicant notes with appreciation the telephone interview courteously afforded the undersigned representative of the Applicant on November 9, 2007, wherein the teachings of the Bohn et al. and Everett et al. references were discussed. Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections on the basis of the arguments discussed at the interview, which are summarized below.

Claim 1 of the present application includes the claim element of a common core on which both the transmitter coil and the receiver coil are wound. As discussed at the interview, Applicant submits that the commonly understood meaning of the term "core" in the context of having coils wound thereon is that the core is composed of ferromagnetic material. In substantiating the rejection of claim 1 based on Bohn et al. and Everett et al., the Examiner cited the circuit board 128 in the Bohn et al. reference as corresponding to such a common core. Applicant submits that equating the circuit board 128 with a core on which coils are wound is contrary to the commonly understood meaning of the term "core" by those of ordinary skill in the field of antenna design. It was agreed at the interview that the

term "common core" would be amended to "common ferromagnetic core" and this would not only distinguish over the Bohn et al. reference, but also would not raise a new issue requiring further searching or consideration, since this is merely making explicit the meaning of the term "core" that is already understood by those of ordinary skill in the field of antenna design.

As also discussed in the telephone interview, the Examiner cited the capacitor 40 in the Everett et al. reference as, according to the Examiner, corresponding to the capacitor in claim 1 that is stated in that claim to correct the frequency of the reception oscillator upon deviation from the resonant frequency caused by the inductance of the transmission coil. Applicant submits that the capacitor 40 in the Everett et al. reference does not perform that function. As stated in the sentence bridging columns 2 and 3 of the Everett et al. reference, as long as the load impedance 42 is substantially greater than the impedance of the capacitor 40 at the frequency of the received signal, little voltage is lost across the capacitor 40. Therefore, the capacitor 40 does not perform the function in the Everett et al. reference or correcting the frequency of an oscillator circuit. The function of the capacitor 40, as is made clear by the aforementioned statement in the Everett et al. reference, is to adapt the impedance so that the tag 34 can be used as a dual frequency antenna. The capacitor 40 does not correct the frequency of the reception oscillator upon deviation from the resonant frequency caused by the inductance of the transmission coil, as required in the language of claim 1 of the present application, since in the Everett et al. embodiment of Figure 3, in which the capacitor 40 is used, there is only a single coil antenna namely the coil antenna 36.

Moreover, as noted above the embodiment of Figure 3 in the Everett et al. reference has only a single coil 36, which is used both for reception and for transmission. Therefore, it is not understood how the embodiment of Figure 3 of Everett et al. could be even considered for use in modifying any of the embodiments disclosed in the Bohn et al. reference, all of which clearly and explicitly make use of two separate coils for reception and transmission, respectively.

In fact, the Everett et al. reference does disclose an embodiment wherein two antennas 48 and 52 are used. In that embodiment, however, a capacitor is not present at all. Applicant therefore submits that the only "candidate" embodiment in the Everett et al. for possible combination with, or use in modifying, the Bohn et al. reference is the embodiment of Figure 4, and this embodiment does not include any capacitor at all. Applicant submits the Everett et al. reference actually teaches away from the subject matter of claim 1, because the capacitor 40 is used only in the embodiment wherein a single coil is used for the dual purposes of transmission and reception, but when two separate antennas are used, as in the embodiment of Figure 4 of Everett et al., no capacitor is present at all.

In the telephone interview, it was agreed that the amendment to claim 1 to add the word "ferromagnetic" would not raise a new issue. It was also agreed at the interview that the above arguments most likely would preclude the Examiner from continuing to rely a combination of Bohn et al. and Everett et al. as a basis for a rejection.

The above arguments are equally applicable to the rejections based on Bohn et al. and Everett et al. and one or more secondary references. Applicant respectfully submits that even if the Examiner's statements concerning the

respective secondary references are correct, modifying the Bohn et al./ Everett et al. combination in accordance with those further teachings still would not result in the subject matter of any dependent claims 2, 3, 4 or 8.

All claims of the application are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Submitted by,

Steven H. Noll (Reg. 28,982)

SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP
CUSTOMER NO. 26574
Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312/258-5790
Attorneys for Applicant.

CH1\5305269.1